

Israel nationals, or touching Israel ports, and that none of the goods consist of German reparations to Israel or contain material manufactured in Israel.

Many firms have courageously resisted this pressure. Business International reported in January 1964 that there were 164 U.S. firms on the Arab blacklist. But many American businessmen who have wanted to trade or invest in Israel have been deterred by Arab threats.

Our Government is on record against these practices and spokesmen have asserted that we neither recognize nor condone the boycott. But as Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS stated:

As far as I know, no one in our Government has ever told an American businessman to throw the questionnaire away.

Mr. Speaker, that, in effect, is the purpose of the bill I have introduced today. It clearly states that it is our policy to oppose and condemn any trade boycotts directed against foreign countries with which we maintain friendly relations. It will prohibit the taking of any action, including the furnishing of information, which would further or support such boycotts. It will at last provide American businessmen with a shield and a weapon against the Arab's illegitimate trade war.

ALLOWING FARMERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE 1965 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to allow farmers participating in the 1965 feed grain program to plant soybeans on diverted feed grain acreage.

This legislation is badly needed because, first, there is no surplus of soybeans but rather a shortage, second, our farmers should have the opportunity to increase their income by growing soybeans on diverted acreage, third, the Government would not have to pay full payments on diverted acreage planted to soybeans, which would result in a substantial saving to the Government, and fourth, the increased soybean exports would help counteract our Nation's serious gold outflow.

Under the present cotton program, the cotton farmer can plant soybeans on his diverted acres, but our feed grain growers are not given this opportunity. The diversion of cotton to soybeans has increased production in South Carolina, for instance, from the 1958-62 average of 9½ million bushels of soybeans to 15½ million bushels last year. And Arkansas, relatively new in the soybean field, has become a top producer of this non-surplus product.

Interestingly enough, the Department of Agriculture admits they think we will soon need a billion bushels of beans a year—and we grew only 700 million bushels last year. We have no surplus as such, and it is conceivable that we could end up with a shortage.

As for our export market—here we are, holding down our soybean production

while the hungry countries of the world are frantic to buy this product. As a matter of fact, we just made a large sale of soybeans to Russia, and it does not look as if the demand will diminish. And while we are holding back our potential, Communist China is capitalizing on our inability to supply this crop by quietly exporting their supply to Japan, one of our leading soybean customers.

It is too late now to do anything about planting soybeans on diverted acres this year under the wheat program, since all the winter wheat is already planted. But feed grain farmers in North Dakota should have the opportunity this year to plant soybeans on diverted acres under the 1965 program. Since the signup has already started and will continue until March 26, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture for his immediate comments on my bill and also am urging the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to act rapidly on it. If the committee will not consent to the fast and speedy action necessary to correct this inequity, I sincerely hope that the introduction of this bill will at least provide the groundwork for such an amendment to any feed grain or wheat program affecting the 1966 and later crops.

North Dakotans need more crop income. Soybeans have become a dependable cultivated crop in eastern North Dakota. This crop is the new leader in our Nation's exports—in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, soybeans brought in to this country \$680 million in cash.

I think it is only fair that our farmers participating in the feed grain program be allowed the opportunity to raise soybeans on their diverted acreage.

FLORIDA CROP ROT THROUGH SHORTAGE OF FARM LABORERS DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to protest the premature and unwise action taken by the Secretary of Labor in cutting off the flow of trained foreign laborers who, for 20 years, have been the mainstay of the harvest force for Florida's citrus and vegetable crops. I have already registered my protest to the Secretary of Labor in a letter which I will insert in the Record following my remarks. In this connection, I am also inserting a copy of a telegram sent Secretary Wirtz by Sheffield T. Aboud, chairman of the board of the Area Development Council, Fort Pierce, Fla.

The result of this shortsighted action by the administration in cutting off the flow of trained foreign laborers, is action resulting in crop rot which might well surpass the effects of the most devastating freezes Florida's citrus industry has ever experienced.

Despite the tremendous unemployment that exists in this country, few domestic

workers are willing to do this kind of work. Those that are willing have been hired. The industries involved and affected by this critical shortage of harvesters have, in good faith, financed the transportation to Florida of numerous laborers in the past and have cooperated with all agencies in trying to encourage domestic laborers to harvest these crops. It has been an exercise in futility.

In the 1963-64 season, for example, only 7 out of 225 workers stayed for the entire season. Most find the job offer attractive only as a way to get to Florida for the winter. Inadequate numbers show an interest in the first place.

The result is that unpicked crops are presently rotting on the ground. Millions of dollars worth of citrus, vegetables, and sugarcane are literally turning to garbage because of the inability to get men to harvest them.

The reason why domestic laborers will not pick fruit can best be summed up in one sentence: "Domestic workers prefer less menial jobs and can get them for the same pay."

Mr. Speaker, the inconsistent actions of this administration become more confusing daily. The President has announced that he wants a revision in the immigration laws with the goal of allowing more people from foreign lands to live and work in the United States. In this proposal, there is assurance from the administration that the domestic labor market will not be harmed.

But, the unemployment situation in the United States is used as justification for not allowing offshore labor to come into this country and pick Florida's crops. If there is any rhyme or reason to this, I must confess its logic escapes me.

To my mind, the administration is engaged in defective reasoning which will ultimately hurt, not only the fruit and citrus growers in Florida, but every consumer in every city throughout the United States who suddenly finds the price of his daily glass of orange juice and the cost of produce and fruit prohibitive.

One of the soundest proposals yet advanced to help alleviate this problem, aside from allowing offshore labor back into the country, was made by Mr. John W. Evins, president of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. He has suggested a classification of unemployed farmworkers in the same manner as unemployed industrial workers are classified. In this way, it might be possible to locate farmworkers willing to harvest crops when they are needed. I understand that Secretary Wirtz says that no useful purpose would be served by such classification, although why he is adverse to any approach that might help the fruit and citrus industry is not explained.

I am herewith inserting in the Record a copy of my letter to Secretary Wirtz, a copy of a wire to Secretary Wirtz from the chairman of the board of the Area Development Council; and a newspaper clipping from the February 4, 1965, issue of the Clearwater Sun which deals with this vital subject:

FEBRUARY 8, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing copy of a telegram from Mr. Sheffield T. Abood, chairman of the board of the Area Development Council from Fort Pierce, Fla., adding his voice to the already resounding demand from the growers of Florida for relief from the labor shortage presently in existence, and demanding that there being no other labor available, additional offshore laborers be permitted to come into the country.

It is almost unbelievable that with unemployment as high as it is in this country no domestic workers are willing to do this kind of work, even though it pays quite well. And, furthermore, it is inexcusable that the Government has developed no programs to provide additional domestic help as needed.

These being the facts, this serious situation is further aggravated by the refusal of the Labor Department to provide, even on a temporary basis, for adequate offshore assistance.

Therefore, the direct responsibility for the inability of Florida growers to harvest their crops rests with your Department; and I demand, as one of many, that a solution be found inasmuch as the economy of this area is substantially crippled.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

FORT PIERCE, FLA.,
February 5, 1965.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

(Copy of telegram sent Secretary of Labor Willard W. Wirtz.)

The decision on your part not to extend 1951 labor agreement for offshore labor to enter the United States was done in the best faith. We know your background reputation for being conscientious at all times.

Being connected with agriculture for over 80 years I feel eventually this will destroy initiative of the growers throughout the United States plus the fact that foreign countries in the last few years have tripled their acreage in produce and citrus. Agricultural labor counting the United States including our offshore labor are already more than four times as much as the cost in foreign countries.

As you know picking citrus, tomatoes, beans, etc., is not for unexperienced people. Some of the people picking tomatoes, citrus, and vegetables have been doing this type of work since they were kids. You can destroy some crops of vegetables in one picking without experience.

A suggestion: Would it not be wise to permit limited offshore labor until other persons can be trained for this type of work? Some of our agricultural regulations are overdue for review and revision.

Furthermore would it not be more advantageous to limit import of competitive produce from foreign countries instead of handicapping our domestic growers by this complete cutoff of essential harvesting labor?

SHEFFIELD T. ABOOD,
Chairman of the Board,
Area Development Council.

FLORIDA CROPS ROTTING IN SUN; WIRTZ
BLAMED

MIAMI.—Millions of dollars worth of citrus, vegetables, and sugarcane are turning to garbage under the winter sun, and farm leaders say the cause is a labor shortage created by the Federal Government.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz has cut off the flow of trained foreign laborers, for 20 years the mainstay of the harvest force, and

raised the minimum wage from 95 cents to \$1.15.

The idea, Wirtz explained, was to "reduce and hopefully eliminate the use of foreign workers" by paying wages attractive to domestics. The Labor Department began a crash program to collect enough domestic labor to harvest the winter crops.

PLAN NOT WORKING

Agriculture spokesmen say the plan is not working because:

1. Industrious workers can earn more than \$1.15 an hour under the longstanding piece-rate system.

2. Domestic workers bound by lack of education or other circumstances to approximately the same wage bracket prefer less menial jobs and are able to get them.

Florida's commissioner of agriculture, Doyle Conner, said Labor Department officials have not acquainted themselves with Florida's problem.

"The cutoff is premature," said Conner. "While they are giving us promises, labor is not coming and the fruit is dropping off the trees."

Conner said domestic workers offered free transportation to Florida by the Government "get off the bus, look at the grove, and head for Miami."

MUST SEEK SOURCES

"All of us feel that we have an obligation to put forth every effort to utilize domestic labor," said Conner. "But if it is not available we must look to every other source."

Herman F. Steele, assistant general manager of Florida Citrus Mutual, a grower organization, says "the inability of citrus growers to move fruit from their groves while in marketable condition is causing a loss estimated at \$4 to \$6 million based on on-tree values."

Steele said warm fall weather caused the crop to mature early and it is dropping off the trees and rotting on the ground.

INEPTNESS OF "STATE DEPARTMENT WAR" IN VIETNAM

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, someone needs to protest our conduct of the war in South Vietnam. Inasmuch as another of my constituents, Sp5c. Jesse H. Pyle, has been killed, I can remain silent no longer.

Although the administration claims there is no war, men are dying just as though there was a war. War materiel is being expended at a rate never attained except in war.

If a military organization had purposefully tried, it could hardly have made more mistakes than the United States has made in South Vietnam. Not one plan or program has been effective or successful and the U.S. position has been deteriorating for years. The disasters announced today indicate that a new low point has been reached.

The announcement in 1963 that we would pull out of South Vietnam by the end of 1965 was a grave mistake from a military standpoint. It practically invited the Communists to step up the war—and they did.

Our participation in masterminding the coup during which President Diem and others were murdered was a terrible political and tactical error. Although Diem may not then have been in a posi-

tion to establish a democratic Republic—with a two-party system in our image—he was the true leader of his country and our most helpful friend in very difficult times.

These and other incidents lend credence to the belief that State Department officials are planning and running the war—a task for which they have insufficient training, experience, or motivation. "People who have never been in a fistfight" are in charge of our effort in South Vietnam, is a common allegation.

Under the circumstances, we cannot win. We can bleed to death; we can bankrupt ourselves; but we cannot win by pursuing the course we now are following.

Inasmuch as I am not privy to the facts, information, and intelligence which is available at all times to the President, I would not be so presumptuous as to suggest another course. All any Member of Congress can do is blindly follow and support the President as the dirty, stinking, dying, costly war in South Vietnam continues to go from bad to worse. But anyone, with any military experience, should protest the flagrant negligence which time after time has cost us human lives, planes and other materiel.

Some time ago, at a U.S. airbase in South Vietnam, a dozen or more of our latest and best planes were totally destroyed on the ground by mortar fire and direct sabotage. It was incredible to most observers that the aircraft should have been so carelessly deployed—and unbelievably tragic that our security and protection were so poor that these planes were unnecessarily lost.

Again, 2 days ago, our airbase near Pleiku was attacked by mortars and direct sabotage with even greater loss of life and property. But for the truly heroic effort of one of my constituents, Sp5c. Jesse A. Pyle, whose own life was sacrificed, the casualties would have been many times greater.

It is one thing for men to die in battle for their country in the cause of freedom—but it is quite another matter for any man to die because of incompetence and negligence in the planning and running of a war.

Apparently the conditions in South Vietnam have deteriorated to the point that it now is a full-fledged war requiring the brains and experience of our best military men. The State Department officials can no longer cope with the situation. We can no longer continue along the unrealistic course they have charted. Loyalty to one's country and one's urgent yearning for peace should not silence one's protest against the unbelievable ineptness and outright negligence which characterize our conduct of the war in South Vietnam—costing us so dearly in lives, property, materiel, and morale.

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. GURNEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

has been referred to, I went to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER] with the request that a joint committee of members of the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate be appointed to go to Selma and make an impartial and fair investigation. He indicated to me that he did not under existing legislation have that authority.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the city of Selma is at this point a stage. It has been turned into a stage, according to a preconceived script that has been set down by Dr. Martin Luther King and his organization, a plan of action for Alabama and for the South.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Selma is a stage and now its public officials have been and are being used as props by people from the outside, outside agitators who have come to the city to organize and lead demonstrations, in certain cases demanding of public officials that they act in direct violation of the laws of our State. This was the case on the Friday we were there. A group demanded of registration officials that they open the office and register citizens on a day in which they were forbidden by State law to do so, demanding that which according to law could not be done.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of certain organizations now active in Selma are not working toward a solution of problems there or toward registering people to vote in Dallas County. They are instead creating a stage, a drama in which they are casting themselves as the central characters, and using the people as their props.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express under these circumstances my commendation to both the people and the public officials of Dallas County and the city of Selma.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Along the line of your discussion, has there been any new issue raised in Selma during the recent weeks of demonstrations that was not already pending in the Federal courts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his question. Indeed not. The demonstrations in Selma have served no purpose of securing rights or privileges of any person or group in Selma or anywhere else. Indeed, whatever relief might be needed or whatever changes should perhaps have been made were taking place through the action of the Congress and of the courts. The only changes which have occurred in Selma and in Dallas County have occurred as a result of the passage of legislation by the Congress of the United States or as a result of actions by the courts. These things were taking place before the demonstrations began and, indeed, the demonstrations had no effect on any of these things.

They served no legislative or judicial purpose, or any other observable purpose, toward securing rights or privileges for people in Selma or in America.

I thank the gentleman for spotlighting this fact which I think is rather important. Under these circumstances the public officials of Selma have conducted themselves with order, with restraint, and with great patience and forbearance. There have been no instances of any kind of mistreatment or brutality by the sheriff of Dallas County or any other law-enforcement officer in this county. To my knowledge, there was no evidence presented at any time of such violence or such mistreatment. I think the record needs to be clear, in that, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] indicated, the press has presented a distorted picture. The law-enforcement officers have tried to keep the peace and enforce the law with patience and restraint in a very complex and difficult situation in which their efforts were perpetually thwarted over a long period of time.

The leadership of the Negro community in Dallas County has been taken out of the hands of local Negroes and taken over by Dr. Martin Luther King and others. The white community has in more than 2 years stayed out of the situation, and I think the people of Selma are thereby to be congratulated and commended for their restraint.

I am reconvicted that there has been a fair and impartial application of law, Federal, State, and local, in Selma and in Dallas County by its public officials. In this matter of rejection of persons seeking to vote, only recently have large numbers of Negro citizens sought to vote in Dallas County. The rejection rate for the armed services is comparable to that of those seeking to register to vote.

May I point out that the mechanics of registration in the State of Alabama are, in my opinion, too slow and, in my further opinion, should be changed so that the registration of citizens of both races might be facilitated. There is legislation, I believe, that will be brought before the Legislature of Alabama at its next regular session to facilitate the registration of American voters.

For example, as reported in articles in both Birmingham papers in the fall of 1964, long before the present demonstrations began in Selma, a distinguished legislator from Jefferson County, the Honorable John Hawkins, had composed a bill to speed up and facilitate the registration of voters in my own county in Alabama. Representative Hawkins' bill would require the board of registrars to visit each precinct of Jefferson County at least once a month to take registration to the people. In addition, it provides that at least once a month people should be registered from 4 to 10 in the evening to facilitate registration for those whose jobs would prevent them from registering during usual hours. It provides further for full-time registrars in Jefferson County. It was the thought of this distinguished and respected member of the Alabama House of Representatives that this bill, which will surely be passed in the regular session of the State legislature in May, would provide a pattern for Alabama counties. I, for one, wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Hawkins' plan and feel it to be good legislation.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that where there may be need for a change of law to speed up the process of registration and make it easier for all citizens and all racial groups to register in my State, but that effort should proceed through the due processes of law and not through demonstrations in the streets. The place in which to make this effort, the place where we refine our gold in this country, I believe to be rightfully in the State legislatures, in the Congress, and in the courts. I cannot believe that these problems can be solved in the streets, and I cannot believe that we can be traveling in a right direction by leading citizens, particularly young people, toward violating laws and defying authority in order to accomplish any purposes, however dear to their hearts.

I believe in the principle of local self-government in America. I have faith that the people of Dallas County and the sovereign State of Alabama will indeed proceed in obedience to Federal, State, and local law in this matter, and will work toward changing whatever State law needs to be changed to facilitate registration for voting in Alabama.

I believe that the people in our city and in this county will be impartially registered to vote, but I would say whatever change we need, let us seek it in the legislature, not in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes in liberty. I believe and would stand for the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for every citizen of the United States, regardless of race, creed, or color. God forbid that I should stand between any man and his God-given right to become what he can become, within the framework of his own ability and limitations. God forbid that I should stand between any man and his lawful liberty. Let there be liberty in fullest measure for every citizen, but liberty can only prosper where there is law. Only within the framework of law can liberty survive.

Therefore, to those who in my own State have been leading others in disobedience to law and in defiance of authority, both local and Federal, let there be liberty, but let us never forget that where there is liberty there must be law. Therefore, I would say, let us work toward the fulfillment of the American dream for all its people. Let us work in the courts, the Congress, the State legislatures, and the courthouse in Selma, Ala., that there might be liberty for all of us, because there is retained in this land the law.

THE RIGHT TO REGISTER TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. GLENN ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the Selma story and other stories planned for San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago, and Philadelphia, by the Negro demonstrators, the question is whether all people regardless of color will have the right to register and vote or whether

they have the right to be registered and be voted by agitators whenever the agitators choose.

Under the Federal court injunction governing registration from now on in Selma, all who wish to register and vote may, I feel, do so. This opportunity has long existed, and far too few have shown an interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. MORSE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. My resolution is identical with one introduced in the Senate on January 6 by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Upward of 50 Members of the Senate are listed as cosponsors of the Monroney resolution.

This resolution is almost identical to the concurrent resolution sponsored in the 79th Congress by Senator LaFollette and the then Representative MONRONEY, which eventually led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Almost 20 years have passed since that time and there is a widespread belief in Congress and in the country that the time has come for a fresh look at the machinery and methods of our national legislature.

Much good was accomplished by the Reform Act of 1946. It streamlined the congressional committee system, a structural change that has survived unchallenged until this day, except for the establishment of the new Science and Astronautics Committees in 1958 created to cope with the legislative problems of the space age. It provided for the expansion of congressional staff aids and led to striking gains in the staffing of the committees of Congress and of the Legislative Reference Service. It ought to strengthen the oversight function of Congress and was followed by an extraordinary increase in the conduct of congressional investigations. The 1946 act also aimed to strengthen congressional control of public expenditures, but its results in this area have proved disappointing. The lobbying title of the act has revealed a wealth of data concerning the extent and cost of group representation before Congress. But the lobby law admittedly suffers from loose draftsmanship and other defects which remain to be corrected.

But the task of congressional reorganization is far from finished. The LaFollette-Monroney committee of the 79th Congress was limited in its terms of reference and the 1946 act, after its passage by the Senate, was pruned in the

House of Representatives and hence was marked by several significant omissions. Meanwhile, the operation of the 1946 act over the past 20 years has revealed some serious defects, while changing conditions have produced some new problems of internal organization and operation. Since 1946 two States have been added to the Union, there are 50 million more Americans, the space age has dawned, and the daily workload of the average Congressman has doubled.

Although the 1964 session of Congress was far more productive of legislative results than the 1963 session, I feel that this was due more to the change in the character of presidential leadership than to any real improvement in the structure and procedures of the Congress. We hear many criticisms of our machinery and methods not only from our own Members in both chambers and in both political parties, but also from political scientists, journalists and commentators, and civic groups like the American Assembly and the National Committee for an Effective Congress. I do not, by any means, subscribe to all the criticisms of the Congress that we read in the public prints. But I do agree that the time has come for a new look—a fresh study—of the organization and operation of our national legislature.

We hear it said, Mr. Speaker, that this body or the other body wastes valuable time in irrelevant debate and in oral roll calls. In his recent book "Congress: The Sapless Branch", the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK, attacks our procedures as "undemocratic and antiquated." In a Senate speech last September that consumed 42 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he set forth a full-length 27-point program for revision of the Senate rules. Other critics allege that, with hundred-billion-dollar annual budgets, Congress has really lost control of the purse strings. That we lag behind public opinion and are more conservative than the country. That we are too susceptible to group pressures in a pressure-group society. That we tend to subordinate national to local and sectional interests because we are locally elected and locally responsible. That we engage in dilatory tactics via the filibuster and the committee pigeonhole. That our investigating committees do not always treat witnesses fairly. That we lack party discipline and that the legislative process is subject to coalition control. That Congress suffers from a dispersion of leadership which is scattered among our elective leaders and among the chairmen of some 300 congressional committees of all types. These and other criticisms would be considered by the joint committee provided for in my resolution.

In a supporting statement made when he introduced his concurrent resolution, Senator MONRONEY said that "the American people expect the Congress to improve its performance. There is a strident and persistent demand for improved congressional practices. Congress needs," he said, "to remodel its legislative machinery." And he went on to list the areas of major importance which, in his opinion, require immediate attention:

First, congressional procedure for dealing with the Federal budget.

Second, committee operation.

Third, earlier adjournment or specified recess periods.

Fourth, reducing the individual Member's caseload.

In addition to these major changes, he also listed many minor changes which could be made to strengthen Congress and simplify its operation.

Mr. Speaker, in an age when representative government is on the defensive all around the world and when it has been eclipsed by dictatorships in many lands, I believe that we must take steps to strengthen our own institution. At a time when the initiative in policymaking seems to be shifting from Congress to the executive and the judiciary, we must be on guard to maintain the place of Congress in the constitutional scheme of checks and balances and we must adopt whatever changes are necessary to enable the Congress to perform its functions more effectively.

THE COMMON ACTION TO BRING PEACE TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few days have literally swept the United States onto the first step of the escalator of war in Vietnam. We will continue upward unless we find a solution that will halt this inevitable holst.

The importance of the war in Vietnam has reached the crucial point which demands immediate attention. Because of its importance, I have made two trips to South Vietnam within the last 9 months—first in June and again in November—to see for myself why we are there and what the possible alternatives are to solving this situation.

Of my own volition and at my own expense I witnessed the "twilight war" as near to war as you can get without actually participating. The information I have secured is firsthand—from Saigon, the serious political area, and from the provinces in the heartland of the vast serious fighting areas. I saw the residue of the Communists' weapons of murder, arson, sabotage, random bombings, and terror.

Let me at the outset, however, make it clear I do not believe we can afford to lose Vietnam. This has been indelibly written in the blood of 277 Americans who have died there. Every responsible individual with whom I spoke—I spoke with hundreds on both trips; and this goes for military, our State Department and other U.S. Government people, the Vietnamese, and most importantly, independent news personnel, for whom I have the utmost respect—all agreed it would do the cause of America and the rest of the free world irreparable harm if we either pulled out or were thrown out.

In 1954 when the Geneva accords halved Vietnam at the 17th parallel, creating the Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh in the north and the non-Communist state in the south, we recognized the importance then of southeast Asia to the free world. In September of the same year the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was born. At that time, the U.S. commitment to do what it could to insure the peace, security, and independence of southeast Asia was made, and made with the support of both political parties. Thailand, the Philippines, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan joined in that commitment. Though not signers of the treaty, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia were at liberty to call on SEATO for help against aggressions.

We are committed to Vietnam. In 1961 when Vietnam appealed to the United States to honor its unilateral declaration of 1954, President Kennedy responded without delay in support of Vietnam by sending more American advisers, arms, and aids. He said:

The United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth.

A position first stated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1954, that—

The imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally by whatever means would be a grave threat to the whole free community. The United States feels that that possibility should not be positively accepted but should be met by united action.

A position President Eisenhower in that same year supported by stating that—

Aggression in . . . southeast Asia are threats to the whole free community to be met by united action.

And just last week President Johnson reaffirmed that position by saying the United States will be "as effective and efficient as we can in helping the people of South Vietnam resist aggression and preserve their freedom."

Vietnam has bared itself before the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, and Red China in an attempt to succeed in becoming an independent free nation. It has thrust its strength forth relying on the commitment we have pledged, the free world has pledged.

Theirs is not just a civil war. When I first visited Vietnam last June, the majority of the equipment used by the Vietcong was captured U.S. materiel. When I returned 6 months later I was told that most of the equipment used by the Vietcong came from Red China. It is also known that some Red Chinese have been involved in field operations with the Vietcong.

This outside influence is underlined by one of the most important speeches made in recent decades on Communist strategy, presented in 1961 by then Chairman Khrushchey in his report on a party conference entitled "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement." Khrushchey stated:

In modern conditions, the following categories of wars should be distinguished:

world wars, local wars, liberation wars, and popular uprisings.

He eliminated world wars and local wars as too dangerous for any real advantage to the Communist cause. But he specifically acknowledged liberation wars in conjunction with Vietnam saying, "It is a sacred war. We recognize such wars."

Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin reaffirms and underscores that recognition by his presence in Hanoi now. His visit also reaffirms and underscores the fact that Vietnam's conflict is not just a civil one.

We have been alarmed at the aspect of Red China producing nuclear weapons, and well we should be. However, if Red China and Russia can achieve success by liberation wars, then there is no necessity for them to risk nuclear holocaust.

Where I traveled there was no nuclear holocaust, only the constant fear of terror, snipers, and guerrilla attack. In the midst of this liberation war I traveled by car on the only open road to Long An Province and Tan On—a road constantly under ambush of grenade and rifle attack—where military vehicles were constantly under fire. We drove 60 miles per hour to avoid attack.

I met with our military advisers whose constant companions are a rifle, a grenade hung from their belt and a .45 packed on their hip.

To learn more about this liberation war, I talked through interpreters with captured Vietcongs, I spent hours with American and European correspondents who have been in Vietnam 2 or more years. I interviewed Vietnamese Government leaders. I spoke with Ambassador Lodge and Ambassador Taylor. I was briefed by MACV—Military Assistance Commander Vietnam—and by their commanding officers. I spoke with Americans, Vietnamese ARVN field commanders, and village chiefs. I did not have time for the Cook's tour and ceremonial dances of the Montagnards normally arranged for visiting firemen.

The tour I took included suspenseful helicopter flights—in some of those that have made the headlines—"Two More U.S. Helicopters Shot Down Over Vietnam"—wearing a flak suit and sitting between gunners who gingerly fingered the trigger of their .50 calibers. We flew over roads that were too cut by mortars to get to inaccessible areas.

I was the first civilian to visit Bien Hoa Airfield after our B-57's were bombed out by the mortars of the Vietcong who zeroed in only about 100 yards from the perimeter of the airfield. At the time I was warned that we could expect future bombing of this sort. For there was no way to guarantee our protection against them. This was underlined only a few days ago in Pleiku.

I visited with some of the wounded who had felt the effect of our own shells fired from captured equipment by the Vietcong.

There is a war going on over there; it is a different war than what we know, as war. It has no course to run. There is no place to hide, not even in Saigon, where 2 days after I left, the restaurant

where I had lunch was bombed and 40 people were wounded.

But war is hell and you can tolerate these things in a war zone. What we cannot tolerate is the continuance of this war.

Solutions have been proposed:

First. Withdrawal from Vietnam: This is totally unacceptable. It would mean rejecting the plea of the Vietnamese to help them remain a free and independent nation. It would evidence to the people of the free world the fact that America does not honor its commitments and many of the uncommitted nations of the world would fall into the Communist camp for lack of security. It would also vindicate the Communist theory of liberation wars, open the gateway into southeast Asia and precipitate the Domino theory—with each individual country falling one after the other, and not necessarily limiting itself to southeast Asia.

Second. Neutralization: If we should neutralize all of Vietnam as was done at the Geneva Conference, and the Communists would honor this neutralization, I would approve. However, they have proven they would not honor their commitments and will not permit the peoples of South Vietnam to remain neutral.

To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, "I believe this Nation cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

We have seen neutralization fail in Laos. Because they did not honor the neutralization of Laos by withdrawing their troops and equipment as the United States did, the Communists now have supply lines running through Laos from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. There continues to be turmoil in Laos. That is the Communist's idea of neutralization. We cannot accept the experience of Laos as an indication that Communist style neutralization will work.

Third. Nuclear intervention: This alternative has already been defeated at the polls in November by the mandate given President Johnson.

Fourth. Escalation of the conflict: A decisive military victory over the Vietcong or their supporters, the North Vietnamese and Red Chinese is out of the question unless we are prepared to pour into this "human quagmire" 2 million American youth to defeat the hundred thousand Vietcong now deployed. Victory over the Communists in Malaysia and the Philippines has outlined a course of action that demands a superiority of 20 to 1 over the guerrillas.

But this is hardly a solution since it would leave us naked against an enemy who stands poised to rape our freedom whenever we stand thus exposed.

Fifth. Continue to assist the South Vietnamese to bring about peace in their own country. All responsible American officials agree this is essential no matter what else be done.

I fully concur and also propose that something else be done. I propose that we meet this aggression with the kind of united action implied by the statements of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. My recommendation for this "united action" is the utilization of SEATO. Utilize other SEATO

members, preferably Asians, in an effort to help terminate this war, in a climate they know well, in an area that affects their future and with their Asian neighbors whom they can better understand and with whom they can better communicate.

This is asking them to support a pledge they made 10 years ago in order that their part of the world may remain free and independent.

SEATO was organized for this purpose. Article II reads:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

And this is followed up by article IV which states:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area * * * would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional process. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence or any party is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense * * * it is understood that no action * * * shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam must be considered within the treaty area.

I quote these articles to emphasize this outstanding option available toward winning peace for South Vietnam:

We're already aiding the Vietnamese in 1,001 ways. But let's not be satisfied when it might prove that the 1,002d way is the decisive one.

Those were the words of Ambassador Taylor upon his arrival in Saigon last July as the new U.S. Ambassador and those words are still applicable.

An option we have not utilized—to bring in a third flag, even fourth, fifth, and sixth—to include other nations of the southeast Asian community is my proposal.

The SEATO members are fully justified in any action to aid Vietnam. For in June 1962 a special report from the International Control Commission, a unit created by the Geneva Conference and composed of a Canadian, an Indian, and a Pole, presented evidence of Hanoi's subversive activities in South Vietnam and specifically found Hanoi guilty of violating the Geneva accords, also violating SEATO's article IV through "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area."

In the past years and as recent as 1964 headlines have read: "SEATO Dead; Just Needs Proper Burial." My plan would resurrect SEATO and solidify it, as a working body, letting it function as a peacekeeping force for southeast Asia, as NATO has done for Europe.

Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs William P. Bundy—whom I met with only yesterday—has said:

Policy is the fruit of history and experience. In essence, our policy derives from (1) the fact of the Communist nations of Asia and their policies; (2) the lessons of the 1930's and of Korea; (3) the logical extension of that fact and these lessons, to what has happened in southeast Asia.

We have learned from Malaya; we have learned from the Philippines, that Communist aggression can be overcome.

In the past year the war in Vietnam has worsened. Even in the past few days, direct attacks on American installations have occurred with greater intensity. Before this conflict is escalated into an earth-shaking struggle, let us call into action SEATO.

Even before the death of Diem, the political instability of South Vietnam has been a liability to the conflict and has resulted in a prolonging effort to bring about peace. Even in view of the political instability South Vietnam has progressed since 1954. It is because of this progress that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese—whose country has suffered serious economic reverses since 1954—no longer attempt to convert South Vietnamese with promises of a better life. It is not easy to stabilize a government within 1 year, 2 years, or even 10 years when, as in the case of South Vietnam, a country is constantly attacked from within, by covert aggression through guerrilla warfare as well as by border attack.

Too often, we look and we criticize, yet it took the United States 7 years after the American Revolution to finally write a Constitution and this was in an atmosphere of relative peace. Politically in Vietnam there is an urgency for patience.

To bring in their Asian neighbors, such as the Philippines, who have experienced the same battles and struggles for an independent and free nation would enable the Vietnamese to learn firsthand from people who can say, "I, too, have been through this; my people, too, have experienced these aggressions; my country, too, has been invaded."

Vietnam's greatest problem is lack of leadership. It has been said in the East nothing grows under a banyan tree—so it was under Diem. He would permit no leader to grow within and, therefore, today the leadership is a many-headed hydra.

The Vietnamese leaders who have survived the numerous coups recognize the need for a massive socioeconomic operation in the country as well as a centralized political unit in the city.

This has been noticed by neighboring leaders.

Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Philippines, Cornelia T. Villareal, whose nation is a member of SEATO, has recognized the importance geographically and psychologically of the conflict in South Vietnam. He, too, suggests:

Out of a collective effort of free peoples, and out of a struggle they share, can come the motivation and ultimately the resolve of

the Vietnamese common masses to make their country survive in freedom.

Developments in the past few days have evinced the need for action. President Kennedy stated:

Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

This we should at all times be prepared to follow. Kosygin's visit to Hanoi underlines the importance of settling this crisis before there is an escalation of war.

His trip accentuates the possibility this war may grow. Up until now, North Vietnam's air threat has been almost nil. Because of this fact we have been at an advantage in assisting the South Vietnamese to withstand the assaults on them. However, I am concerned now lest the Kosygin visit herald addition of Russian air power support to North Vietnam. Awareness of this possibility reveals an urgency as has never before existed to bring this conflict to a conclusion before an international crisis develops.

I ask that we, as a member, immediately call a meeting of SEATO, in order that action toward peace, rather than drifting toward peril, may result.

We cannot continue to let the situation deteriorate. I believe America must not only advise the Vietnamese in bringing about a peaceful conclusion to their struggle, but that we must also exercise leadership in bringing peace to Vietnam.

THE JENKINS FARCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "The Jenkins Farce.")

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes completely clear that every effort is being made to permit Walter Jenkins to avoid giving testimony in a forum where Republicans would have a chance to ask penetrating questions and hope to obtain responsive answers.

Jenkins, it will be remembered, is the longtime aid and business manager to President Lyndon Johnson. He resigned his job at the White House last fall after his second arrest in the District of Columbia on morals charges.

The latest development in this bizarre case was the agreement yesterday by Democrat members on the Rules Committee of the other body that they would not authorize an independent psychiatrist to examine Jenkins. This on the claim that Jenkins might be harmed in some way if another psychiatrist talks to him.

Thus an interesting procedure is developing. Republican members of the committee will be permitted to submit questions along with Democrat members, but here is the sneaker: What kind of questions will get through the Democrat screen? Even if some tough questions are approved by the Democrats, there will still be the problem of getting full

the productive potential of the lands decreases * * *

Clearly it was the intent of the Reclamation Act primarily to provide small homesteads upon which, at the turn of the century, a family could support itself raising most of its own food needs. In addition, because any irrigation project must have advance assurance that there will be landowners to order water, and to whom the cost of the project could be charged, considering that no landowner could be forced to order water, it was necessary to break up large land holdings into small ownerships requiring water rights, so that communities could be developed.

It is evident, by the abrupt reversal of the previous policy and interpretation of the Boulder Canyon Project Act as affecting Imperial Valley by the present administration, that the Government is still concerned about promoting small family farms. No consideration seems to be given to the fact that the type of agriculture conducted in Imperial Valley is on a large scale, and the trend has been toward consolidating of farms for efficiency. This has resulted in less individual ownership; and the fact that many small farmers, unable to compete without heavy farming equipment that small acreages cannot justify, moved to the cities to take industrial jobs, as have their sons and daughters. The problem faced is one that troubled the Government after World War I, when food was at a premium: "How are you going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paroo?"—Or after they have earned high wages in city industry.

In Imperial Valley, there were 2,932 individual farms in 1944, ranging in size from 10 to over 1,000 acres. Of these, 2,743 were under 500 acres. By 1960, ownerships were reduced to 1,391 in number, including 1,029 farms under 500 acres, and 24 ownerships of from 1,000 to 9,000 acres.

Some of the so-called "big farmers" of Imperial Valley are men who started with small acreages many years ago, working hard and bearing many hardships in the early years as they struggled to tame the desert without the benefit of air conditioning and modern equipment. By sheer determination and persistence they succeeded, and grandly increased their acreages. These "big farmers" are an integral part of the community, working for its success, serving on governmental bodies and committees, supporting local institutions, paying local taxes and buying locally. They are an asset to the community, and no one begrudges them a cottonpicking acre of land that they paid for and pay taxes on.

But there are big farming interests from other areas who purchased large blocks of Imperial lands after being squeezed out of other operations by the sprawling growth of metropolitan areas. They have no interests in Imperial Valley; pay as little taxes as possible; do their buying elsewhere and return few profits to the land that supports them. Complaints of local residents over these huge operations that are as parasites on the edges of the community are what led to the congressional reexamination of the application of excess land laws to Imperial Valley.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1964, I delivered a major speech on the

Vietnam situation in which I urged that the United States seek a negotiated settlement in that war-torn area of the world. The situation has now reached crisis proportions. In today's New York Times there is an editorial and an article by the distinguished columnist, James Reston, which I urge my colleagues to read.

As the editorial says, there are crucial questions which remain unanswered, and the American people are entitled to a straightforward explanation of our policy.

As James Reston says, "the first step in this is clearly a self-imposed ceasefire on both side of the line."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]

WHAT PRICE VIETNAM?

There is no cause to quarrel with the sentiments of President Johnson in commenting to his Boy Scout visitors on the American reprisals against North Vietnam:

"We love peace," he said, " * * * but we love liberty the more and we shall take up any threat, we shall pay any price to make certain that freedom shall not perish from this earth."

The people of the United States do love peace; they love freedom; they will fight for it. Mr. Johnson was on completely safe ground, even to a little forgivable plagiarism from Abraham Lincoln.

But the American public is not asking for truisms about Vietnam. It must surely want sound, solid, persuasive arguments to justify the cost in lives and materiel, and the risks being run in this dangerous southeast corner of the continent of Asia.

The true reasons tend to be blurred by rhetoric. The United States is not in Vietnam, as is so often implied by the White House and State Department, in order to bring democracy, Western style, to Vietnam. It would indeed be helpful if Saigon did have a popular, stable, democratic government; but the historic, political, social, religious and tribal factors militate against such a development, without counting the personal rivalries of generals and politicians. Those who profit by the American presence want the United States to stay. Those who feel frustrated by American power—nationalists, Communists, Buddhists and probably the majority of the peasantry, who simply ask to be left alone—want the Americans to go.

The plain fact, which such fine language as President Johnson's tends to confuse, is that the United States is in Vietnam because it believes that its own security is involved. Vietnam is a battle in the cold war, which is sometimes hot. The Americans went into Vietnam in 1954 to fill the vacuum left by the French and to contain the advance of communism in that part of southeast Asia.

The motives are exemplary and every American can be proud of them, but the crucial questions are: Can it be done? Is the price too high? Was the military decision in the Kennedy administration to increase American forces in Vietnam mistaken? Are the dangers of escalation too great? Is this a good battleground of the cold war on which to fight? Is the United States losing more than it is gaining? All leads up to the basic question that some Senators are asking: Is this war necessary?

These questions cannot be answered by saying that "freedom shall not perish from this earth." The questions reflect genuine doubts and anxieties. They require precise answers. The American people should not be asked to take the sacrifices of Vietnam for granted. There has been a confusion in the public mind which Washington has thus far failed to dispel.

A straightforward explanation on a high intellectual level of practical politics and

strategy is in order. Americans would then, at least, be in a position to resolve their own doubts one way or another.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]
WASHINGTON: A TIME FOR REFLECTION ON VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—This may not be a bad time to take a hard look at the nature and mathematics of the war in Vietnam.

According to the official intelligence estimates, the Communists are now sending between 500 and 1,000 new trained revolutionaries a month into South Vietnam.

These are both the brains and the bone structure of the Communist apparatus now operating below the 17th parallel. They number, to the best of our knowledge, between 28,000 and 34,000, and lead between 60,000 and 80,000 night raiders who operate in small units all over the country.

Behind these guerrillas in North Vietnam is an uncommitted army estimated here at 225,000 men. This is the successor to the force that defeated a French Army of over 380,000, ending 70 years of French control over Indochina, and cost the French 172,000 casualties.

THE DECEPTIVE FIGURES

The force levels on our side are impressive but misleading. The South Vietnamese have 240,000 men in their army, navy, air force, and marines; and another 290,000 in the national guard, military police, special forces, coast guard, and national police.

These are backed, trained, and often transported by U.S. forces, now numbering 23,000, who have overwhelming superiority in fire power, air power, and naval power.

The mathematics of guerrilla warfare, however, is nothing like the mathematics of normal warfare. The Algerian rebels prevailed over the best of the French Army, though they were outnumbered by more than 20 to 1.

The problem is quite different from what it was when the Communist PT boats attacked our destroyers in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin. Then it was possible to attack and knock out the PT bases. The target was clear and the counterattack effective.

Stopping the flow of Communist infiltrators into South Vietnam, however, is a quite different thing. They leave from many different parts of Communist territory in very small numbers and reach the south by many different trails, most of them hidden in the jungle.

Trying to spot-bomb this steady trickle of revolutionaries is like trying to bomb a stream of water. We can make a big splash in the headlines, but the stream will go on.

THE INFILTRATION PROBLEM

President Johnson, therefore, still faces his most difficult problem. As long as he was faced merely with punishing an isolated Communist attack, he could strike and fail back. But stopping the infiltration, which as he says is the main problem, will probably require much greater risks than he has ventured to assume so far.

"We seek no wider war," he said in a White House statement. "Whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors. The key to the situation remains the cessation of infiltration from North Vietnam and the clear indication by the Hanoi regime that it is prepared to cease aggression against its neighbors."

Nobody should underestimate the seriousness of this remark. It is a clear threat that the war will be extended unless Hanoi withdraws, and there is absolutely no indication by Hanoi or its Communist backers that withdrawal is intended.

The President does not want to go north or retreat south. But he is now in a position that satisfies very few people. He has com-

promised between those here who want him to go on about as before and those who want him to use his airpower on the Communist industry in the north. He has issued a challenge and given the Communists the initiative in deciding what to do about it.

A KOREAN SOLUTION?

This is an odd thing to do at a time when officials here are telling us that the war is really going well—despite the political troubles in Saigon—but anyway it has been done and an elaborate test of will and pride is now ahead.

In this situation, the main hope is that both sides will stop where they are for a while and think. The United States cannot win the battle on the ground without a major effort against the uncommitted North Vietnamese Army of a quarter of a million men, and the North Vietnamese cannot win against the air and naval power of the United States.

The Korean solution of a cease-fire and withdrawal on either side of the 17th parallel is probably the best anybody can get out of it, and the first step in this is clearly a self-imposed ceasefire on both sides of the line.

The National Medal of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, along with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I had the honor of being at the White House on February 8, 1965, for the presentation of the National Medal of Science to distinguished recipients of this honor for the year 1964.

The National Medal of Science was established by the 86th Congress to be awarded by the President to individuals "who in his judgment are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to knowledge in the physical, biological, mathematical, or engineering sciences." The awards are made on the basis of recommendations received from the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science. The members of the President's Committee are: Dr. Frank Brink, Jr., chairman of the Rockefeller Institute; Prof. Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University; Dean Gordon S. Brown, School of Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. Herbert E. Carter of the University of Illinois; Dean Kenneth E. Clark, College of Arts and Science, University of Rochester; Dr. Sterling B. Hendricks of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology; Dean Frederick C. Lindvall, division of engineering, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Walsh McDermott of the Cornell Medical Center; Prof. Roger Revelle of the Harvard School of Public Health; Prof. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences; and Prof. Albert W. Tucker of Princeton University.

In 1962 Theodore von Karman was the first recipient of the medal and in 1963

President Johnson awarded the National Medal of Science to Luis W. Alvarez, Vannevar Bush, John R. Pierce, Cornelis B. van Niel, and Norbert Wiener.

The 1964 honorees are Roger Adams, Othmar H. Ammann, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Charles S. Draper, Solomon Lefschetz, Neal E. Miller, Martson Morse, Marshall W. Nirenberg, Julian Schwinger, Harold C. Urey, and Robert B. Woodward. Their biographical sketches follow:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF 1964 HONOREES

Dr. Roger Adams was born in Boston, Mass., in 1889 and studied at Harvard University, receiving his A.B. in 1910, and his Ph. D. in 1912 from that institution. Since 1916 he has been associated with the University of Illinois where he is presently a professor of chemistry, emeritus. Dr. Adams has received innumerable honors including the American Chemical Society's Willard Gibbs Medal in 1936 and its Priestly Medal in 1946. Since the period of the First World War he has been a leading figure in organic chemistry and during most of that period he was the one recognized leader in the field. He earned this place of honor not only because of his numerous and distinguished contributions to organic chemistry but also for his devotion to science and scientists active in the field. Dr. Adams' citation reads: "For superb contributions as a scientist, teacher, and imaginative leader in furthering the constructive interaction of academic and industrial scientists."

Dr. Othmar Herman Ammann was born in Schaffhausen, Switzerland, in 1879 and received his formal education at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. He is presently a consulting engineer and partner in the firm Ammann & Whitney in New York City. Dr. Ammann's professional career spans nearly 60 years and is permanently recorded in the great bridges whose beauty and utility are the product of his bold and imaginative design. Such bridges include the Queensboro Bridge, Goethals Bridge, and George Washington Bridge. His latest and greatest achievement is the Verrazano Bridge in New York which had opened late in November. In all of his work Dr. Ammann has been responsive to the needs of the community and sensitive to aesthetic value as well as function. Dr. Ammann's citation reads: "For a half century of distinguished leadership in the design of great bridges which combine beauty and utility with bold engineering concept and method."

Dr. Theodosius Dobzhansky was born in Nemirov, Russia, in 1900. He received his diploma degree from the University of Kiev in 1921, following which he was associated with the University of Kiev and the University of Leningrad. In 1927 he came to the United States, becoming a naturalized citizen in 1937. Since 1927 he has been a member of the faculty at the California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and is now a professor and member of the Rockefeller Institute in New York City. For a period of nearly 50 years Dr. Dobzhansky has been probably the world leader in experimental population genetics and its application to the problem of evolution. Dr. Dobzhansky's citation reads: "For fundamental studies of the genetic determinants of organ evolution and for penetrating analysis of the genetic and cultural evolution of man."

Dr. Charles Stark Draper was born in Windsor, Mo., in 1901 and received his B.A. degree in psychology from Stanford University in 1919. Since 1922 he has been associated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and has three degrees from MIT—a B.S. in 1928, an M.A. in 1928, and an Sc. D. in physics in 1938. He is currently head of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics and has been the director since

1939 of the MIT Instrumentation Laboratory, a laboratory which has been devoted to devising guidance, navigation, and control systems for airplanes, missiles, ships, satellites, and spacecraft. At the present time, developments made under Dr. Draper's supervision are in wide use by both the Air Force and Navy. Dr. Draper is also responsible for an extended curriculum of courses in the fields of instrument engineering and fire control. Dr. Draper's citation reads: "For innumerable imaginative engineering achievements which met urgent national needs of instrumentation, control, and guidance in aeronautics and astronautics."

Dr. Solomon Lefschetz was born in Moscow, Russia, in 1884 and received his early training in engineering in Paris. Coming to this country shortly after the turn of the century, Dr. Lefschetz was awarded his Ph. D. degree from Clark University in 1911 and was subsequently a member of the faculty at the University of Nebraska and the University of Kansas. In 1924 he joined the faculty at Princeton University where he is professor emeritus of mathematics. He has also directed research in mathematics at the Research Institute for Advanced Studies and now heads a research group at Brown University. Dr. Lefschetz opened up the field of algebraic topology which he and his students have pushed to the forefront of current spectacular progress in pure mathematics. He has done outstanding work in algebraic geometry and in more recent years has directed research in the applied area of nonlinear differential equations. Dr. Lefschetz's citation reads: "For indomitable leadership in developing mathematics and training mathematicians, for fundamental publications in algebraic geometry and topology, and for stimulating needed research in nonlinear control processes."

Dr. Neal Elgar Miller was born in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1909 and received his B.S. degree from the University of Washington, his M.A. degree from Stanford University and his Ph.D. degree from Yale in 1935. He is presently Angell professor of psychology at Yale. Dr. Miller is primarily known for his work which has resulted in a greatly improved understanding of motivational factors as they influence learning and behavior. His early contributions to the understanding of frustration and aggression, and motivation and learning are classics. In more recent years Dr. Miller has been interested in the field of motivation from the physiological standpoint and has developed new techniques of intracranial stimulation and chemical injection to study the role which certain centers of the brain play in affecting responses to different reinforcements. Dr. Miller's citation reads: "For sustained and imaginative research on principles of learning and motivation and illuminating behavioral analysis of the effects of direct electrical stimulation of the brain."

Dr. Marston Morse was born in Waterville, Maine, in 1892 and received his early education at Colby College. In 1915 he was awarded an M.A. degree from Harvard and in 1917 his Ph. D. from that same institution. Dr. Morse subsequently served on the staffs of Cornell University and Brown University before returning to Harvard in 1926. In 1935 he accepted a professorship at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., where he has remained until the present time. Dr. Morse is well known for his work in topology and today some of the world's ablest young mathematicians are refining and extending theories developed by him, as a basic part of the new field of differential topology. Dr. Morse's citation reads: "For extraordinary achievement in creating analytic theories in the large, for statesmanship in the world of mathematics, and for distinguished service to his country in war and peace."

Dr. Marshall Warren Nirenberg was born in New York City in 1927 and received his

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2539

Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 9, as follows:

(No. 19 Leg.)

YEAS—62

Anderson	Hartke	Muskie
Bass	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Cannon	Kuchel	Smathers
Case	Magnuson	Smith
Church	Mansfield	Sparkman
Cooper	McClellan	Stennis
Curtis	McGee	Symington
Dominick	McIntyre	Talmadge
Douglas	McNamara	Thurmond
Ellender	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Monroney	Yarborough
Gruening	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hart	Moss	

NAYS—9

Alken	Cotton	Murphy
Boggs	Fannin	Pearson
Carlson	Javits	Prouty

No. 27—16

NOT VOTING—29

Allott	Hruska	Morse
Bartlett	Inouye	Mundt
Bennett	Johnston	Ribicoff
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Russell
Dirksen	Lausche	Saltonstall
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Scott
Eastland	Long, La.	Simpson
Fong	McCarthy	Tower
Gore	McGovern	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Miller	

So the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 4 was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 4 was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we all grieve the news that more American lives have been lost in South Vietnam. The President bears a heavy burden of decision. The seal of his office is an American eagle, clutching a bundle of arrows in one claw and an olive branch in the other. The judicious use of both the arrows and the olive branch represents our best hope of avoiding a widening war in Asia.

Our retaliatory blows should make it clear to Hanoi and Peiping that we will not quit under fire, nor withdraw, nor submit to Communist coercion. We can strike back by air and sea, from floating bases which are beyond Communist reach, and inflict heavy punishment upon them. Ours is not a position of weakness.

Therefore, it would behoove the Communists to desist, and to explore with us, and the other nations concerned, a way to an honorable settlement in southeast Asia—one which will guarantee both the neutrality and the independence of South Vietnam.

PAUL KITCHIN RETURNS TO NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in each Congress there are a number of changes among the Members and the various committee staffs which cause each of us to feel a little less whole because of their absence. During the early days of this Congress, I have felt keenly the departure of a good friend and talented lawyer—the Honorable A. Paul Kitchen, a distinguished former Member of Congress, who has served the Senate so effectively as chief counsel of the Revision and Codification Subcommittee.

Paul Kitchen brought to the subcommittee a vast reservoir of experience. He is a competent and dedicated public official who has made an invaluable contribution to the Nation. I am sorry that I shall no longer have the daily benefit of his wise counsel, but I am delighted to know that the people of North Carolina will gain a fine citizen and attorney. He will carry to the people of North

Carolina the experience and wisdom gained from more than 20 years of public service, and I am sure they will benefit from it. I am certain that my colleagues here join me in wishing for him and his lovely wife much happiness as they return to their home in Wadesboro.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the administration's education bill, which provides aid to parochial students by allowing them to use public school textbooks and public facilities on a shared time basis, is evidence of the increasing demands from religious institutions for access to the Federal Treasury. Because of the precedent established by such cases as *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, an ordinary taxpayer is generally precluded from contesting the constitutionality of these Federal expenditures to sectarian schools on the grounds that he does not possess sufficient standing to bring suit. As a consequence, a taxpayer whose rights guaranteed by the first amendment are actually violated may be without a judicial remedy.

The administration's bill makes it imperative that Congress establish legal procedures to determine whether this indirect aid to religious institutions conflicts with the mandate of the first amendment, which provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The Washington Post for February 9 contained an editorial which takes an analogous position. The writer stated that it is important for the education bill to "contain a clause facilitating judicial review, so that courts may challenge and veto any practice which oversteps constitutional boundaries." In continuing, the writer expressed a sentiment with which I am in complete agreement.

Vital as education is to the national welfare—

He said—

it would be a travesty and a tragedy if the wall of separation between church and state were destroyed by a Federal aid to education program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of February 9, entitled "Support for the Schools," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOLS

For 20 years, Federal aid to education has been wrecked in Congress after Congress either on the Scylla of segregation or the Charybdis of church affiliation. Time and again, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL has added to a Federal aid bill his rider forbidding the allocation of funds to any school district discriminating among pupils on grounds of race; passage of the rider assured defeat of the bill. Similarly, strong differ-

ences of opinion regarding the extension of Federal aid to parochial as well as public schools have produced a succession of legislative stalemates.

There are high hopes that the current Federal-aid measure can escape these twin disasters. The situation has changed significantly. In the first place, Congress has, in effect, written the Powell amendment into the Civil Rights Act; there is now no need to prohibit the allocation of Federal funds to segregated schools, because the prohibition has become a matter of law. The religious issue is not quite so clearly settled. But the Supreme Court decisions in the prayer and Bible-reading cases have placed the issue in a new light. As we read these decisions, they hold that the first amendment precludes religious observances or indoctrination in tax-supported primary or secondary schools. Religious schools could not, therefore, accept Federal financial grants without abandoning their essential basis for existence.

President Johnson's current Federal-aid proposal seeks to compromise the religious issue without violating any constitutional principle. A compromise, by definition, is a settlement by which contending parties derive benefits sufficient to make the settlement acceptable. This seems to have been accomplished by the President's bill. Catholic leaders who felt strongly that earlier versions of Federal aid were unjust to their faith in excluding aid to parochial schools now seem inclined to support the current measure. And some, although by no means all, who insisted that any aid to parochial schools would be both unwise and unconstitutional, now acquiesce in the President's solution.

The solution gives aid to children indiscriminately, without giving direct aid to parochial schools. It does this, in the main, by utilization of certain community facilities on a shared time basis and by making available to children in private schools textbooks and related materials approved for use in public schools, with a proviso that they should not be employed for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

These are real benefits, and there should be no blinking at the fact. They make it easier and less costly for Catholic parents to send their children to parochial schools, or for any other parents to send their children to religiously oriented private schools, and to this extent they may be considered a governmental support of religion.

Several thoughtful and conscientious witnesses appearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor have opposed these features of the bill as constitutionally invalid and, as one put it, fatal to the integrity of our independent, secular public school system. We think these objections deserve the most careful consideration. Perhaps they can be overcome by more precise draftsmanship. The textbook provision in particular should be subjected to exacting debate.

We continue, however, to favor enactment of the bill. Determination of its constitutionality can be finally achieved only through specific application of its provisions. And these will be different in different places, for the measure affords a good deal of latitude to local community agencies. If the bill becomes law, shared time will be implemented one way in Wilkes-Barre, another way in Terre Haute, and the courts will have to decide what is permissible and what is impermissible by the traditional process of judicial inclusion and exclusion.

For this reason, we believe it imperative that the bill contain a clause facilitating judicial review, so that courts may challenge and veto any practice which oversteps constitutional boundaries. Vital as education is to the national welfare, it would be a travesty and a tragedy if the wall of separation between church and state were destroyed by a Federal-aid-to-education program.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, each year thousands of tourists, mostly schoolchildren, visit our Nation's Capital. During this visit these students tour the FBI, the Smithsonian Institution, the White House, and other places of interest, as well as the Capitol building itself. All of these public buildings are available in most instances with guide services free of charge except the Capitol.

Visitors who wish a tour of our Nation's Capitol are charged 25 cents each, and schoolchildren are charged 15 cents each.

I asked the Library of Congress to do some research as to the guide service that is provided in other capitol buildings throughout the world. It appears that in practically all of the major capitols of the world there is no admission fee.

It is true that at some of the foreign capitols guide service is not always provided, but in most instances free guide service is available to visitors. In none of the countries which the Library of Congress checked—France, Italy, the Soviet Union, West Germany, Canada, Great Britain, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile—were there any admission charges.

In my opinion a nation as prosperous as the United States of America can afford to give to its visitors, mostly schoolchildren, free guide service. In order to correct this present situation I am today introducing a bill, the purpose of which is to authorize the employment under the Civil Service rules of an adequate number of professional guides to take care of the guests of our Nation's Capitol.

Surely, the U.S. Government is not so desperate financially that it has to levy a 15 cent toll on the schoolchildren who visit the U.S. Capitol to observe democracy in action.

I ask unanimous consent that a report covering the guide service of the numerous capitols throughout the world, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The following information was received from various sources with regard to their practice of showing visitors through their capitol buildings:

FRANCE

France charges no admission fee to enter its Parliament. However, one must get permission from the Secretary of Parliament before he can be admitted. This is best accomplished through the good offices of a member of the French Parliament. There is no guide service, but a man at the front desk will gladly answer pertinent questions.

ITALY

Italy is in a rather unique situation. Its Parliament building is controlled by the municipal government of Rome. Nevertheless, this setup does not markedly alter their practice of guide service. There is no admission fee, but one must have a special pass.

A foreign visitor may obtain such a pass upon the recommendation of his respective Embassy. There is no guide service per se, but a guard accompanies all tourists, and he will attempt to answer questions and explain about the building.

SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union likewise imposes no entrance fee upon tourists desiring to see the Kremlin. All the buildings are open to the public every day. No special arrangements for gaining admittance need be made for any of the buildings except the Oruzhanaya Palata. It, too, is open to the general public, but there is generally such a long time of people waiting to get in that it would be wise to arrange for a special tour. The regular guides speak in Russian, but one can obtain an interpreter through Intourist for whatever period is desired.

WEST GERMANY

West Germany charges no admission fee and provides free guide service for those parts of the Bundeshaus which are open to the public. The guide service is operated by the Bundestag administration.

CANADA

Canada also charges no admission fee, and provides free guide service through its Houses of Parliament in Ottawa.

GREAT BRITAIN

Great Britain charges no admission fee, but provides no free Government-operated guide service. Foreign tourists may obtain passes to see Parliament in session by contacting either a Member of Parliament or their respective Embassy. The Houses of Parliament are open to the public on Saturdays and on certain holidays, when Parliament is not meeting.

MEXICO

National Palace: Permission to tour building can be obtained anytime from the Intendente del Palacio whose office is in the palace. The Government provides guides to conduct visitors through apartments. A tip of 2.50 pesos (20 cents) per guide is suggested. One or two pesos for the employee of the palace. (Terry's Guide to Mexico, 1948).

ARGENTINA

According to Mr. Mathe, first secretary of the Embassy in Washington, there is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

CHILE

There is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

BARRY A. SKLAR,
JOHN S. GOSNELL,
Foreign Affairs Division.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE SINCE JANUARY 4

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, prior to the brief recess honoring Lincoln's birthday, let us review what we have been able to accomplish so far since January 4. Our first major piece of legislation was the passage of S. 4, the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, establishing water quality standards and authorizing \$80 million in new grants to help the States and localities, which was so capably handled by Senator MUSKIE and Senator BOGGS. Immediately following passage of this bill, the Senate under the capable leadership of Senators RANDOLPH, McNAMARA, and COOPER passed the \$1.082.4 billion aid to Appalachia bill.